4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

chians and Tivercians between the Dnieper and the Dniester as late as the ninth century, remarking that their settlements once extended as far as the coast of the Black Sea. These are, however, the same tribes who later took refuge in the eastern Carpathians and are the ancestors of the modern inhabitants of Subcarpathian Russia. In any case, after the elimination of the Avars, the East Slavic process of southward settlement was resumed until it was once more interrupted by the passage of the Magyars across southern Russia after the middle of the ninth century, and by subsequent inroads of the Pechenegs (Patzinaks), another wave of Turko-Tartar nomads, in the tenth century. Hence, among the earliest traditions preserved in the medieval Russian annals is that the South Russian Slavic tribes were ancient Khazar tributaries. In the early ninth century these subject tribes extended up the Dnieper as far as the river Sozh, well north of Kiev, and thus brought the whole initial extent of the subsequent principality of Kiev under Khazar tutelage.

The Khazars were a progressive race capable of rapid intellectual development and avid in the absorption of foreign ideas. Despite close diplomatic relations with Byzantium, they carefully sidestepped all influence toward conversion to Christianity with its political implications. Persecutions of the Jews in Byzantium during the reign of Leo III (717-740) caused a considerable Jewish migration from the Empire to the Khazar cities around the straits of Kerch. Since these Khazar centers (Kerch and Phanagoria, together with Itil, at the mouth of the Volga) were the chief transit points for Asiatic trade with the west, the Jewish settlers found abundant scope for their innate commercial talents, and rapidly came to exert a pronounced intellectual influence which culminated in the eighth century in the conversion of the Khazar ruling classes to Judaism. A remarkable feature of the Khazar polity was its religious tolerance, which guaranteed equal privileges not only to Jew and Moslem, but also to Christian refugees fleeing the rigors of the iconoclastic movement in Byzantium itself.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

the Volga artery. It is a historical fact of prime importance that the Scandinavian warrior-merchants who settled among the primitive Eastern Slavs founded no new towns themselves, but by their superior energy and military prowess made themselves the ruling class in urban centers of population which already existed. They were not the creators of the river-borne commerce from which they gained their livelihood. The routes and staples of this commerce had been defined far back in the early ages of the Mediterranean world, and the Russes who built up prosperous commercial relations with Byzantium simply renewed a system of exchange temporarily disjointed by the vicissitudes of nomadic movements.

Kiev was the chief trading post of the lower Dnieper valley, the center at which merchandise was collected for shipment to the Crimea or to Byzantium. The Viking or so-called Varangian chief who controlled Kiev was thus likely to surpass in wealth and prestige his competitors in the more northern cities. The domestic activity of a Kievan prince of the early tenth century consisted chiefly in collecting tribute in kind, the proceeds of which not only supported his family and the retainers on whom his military power was founded, but also served as a basis for trade, which was under the prince's direct control. As the early Varangian princes imposed their sovereignty over successive towns, they delegated a viceroy to each, but the practice of assigning junior princes of the ruling family to subject cities begins only with Prince Sviatoslav (956-972), father of Vladimir I, under whom the Russians were converted. By the early tenth century, the outlying tribes had been tied together in a loose confederation connected with Kiev by economic interests dictated by trade with Constantinople, and this trade was regulated by a formal treaty as early as 907.

The magnificence of the Byzantine capital early exercised its attraction on the Kievan aristocracy. Vladimir's grandmother, the Princess Olga (a lady of pure Scandinavian stock) not only administered the principality after her husband's violent death, but in 975 became a convert to Christianity and

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

made a ceremonial visit to Constantinople, where she was sumptuously entertained by the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who has left us a detailed account of the occasion. Her son Sviatoslav, Vladimir's father, remained a convinced pagan, and is best known to history for his overthrow of the Khazar khanate in 962, his extension of Kievan authority to the upper Volga, and his disastrous attempts to subjugate Bulgaria between 968 and 971. He was, in fact, slain by the nomad Pechenegs at the rapids of the Dnieper while returning home from a crushing defeat at the hands of the Byzantine emperor John Tzimisces.

After his father's death Vladimir, who at the time was prince of Novrogod, opened hostilities against his half-brother who had succeeded Sviatoslav, and by his opponent's death became heir to Kiev. Before his conversion he had consolidated his power in the Dnieper valley, confirmed his father's conquest of the region between the Dnieper and the upper Volga, pushed his domains to the northeastern river courses feeding the Baltic, and made important gains at the expense of the Poles in Volhynia and Galicia. His ingenuity transformed a loose confederation with but weak control of its periphery into a unified Russian domain. That this unity was maintained with difficulty under his immediate descendants and was eventually dissolved was a consequence of local particularism aggravated by economic derangement, of feuds in the princely family, and of the pressure of nomad invaders.

The principality of Kiev became a state of European importance by Vladimir's conquests and conversion. The reign of his son Yaroslav the Wise from 1017 to 1054 is the meridian of its greatness. Yaroslav himself was a prince of rare intelligence and broad international contacts. He had himself married Ingigerd, a Swedish princess who had earlier been engaged to King Olaf Haraldsson of Norway. His sister Maria married King Kizimir I of Poland; of his daughters, one married King Henry I of France; a second Harald the Severe, King of Norway; a third King Andrew of Hungary. His son Vsevolod

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

175* was the husband of a Greek princess, and the son of this union
643 eventually became the consort of Gytha, daughter of the Saxon
631 Harold who fell at Hastings in 1066. Kiev was thus united with contemporary European states by a series of dynastic alliances foreshadowing the customs of modern times.

175* Yet for all his power and wealth, Yaroslav governed by the
643 same simple mechanism that had prevailed under Vladimir. The prince won his position by force and maintained it by personal supremacy, supported by Varangian mercenaries recruited from Scandinavia whenever domestic levies proved insufficient or disloyal, and consulting with his chief military aides, with the city elders, or with church dignitaries on matters of general
[671] policy. Yaroslav began the codification of customary civil and
[795] ecclesiastical law, encouraged both translations and original literature, and endeavored without success to emancipate the Russian Church from the Byzantine patriarchate. By his crushing victory over the nomad Pechenegs before the walls of Kiev in 1036, he made the marches of his principality safe for thirty-five years.

175* Beside rebuilding his father's Church of the Tithe after it
643 was damaged by fire in 1017, he carried out a large-scale con-
346 struction program which made Kiev one of the most notable
532 medieval cities. His great cathedral of Saint Sophia in Kiev, with its five apses and thirteen cupolas, still contains the largest extant yardage of eleventh-century Byzantine frescoes and a series of remarkably preserved mosaics of impressive beauty. This is the one medieval Russian church which has been exhaustively studied by American archaeologists in coöperation with native Russian colleagues.

175* The underlying weakness of the Kievan principality lay in
643 the fact that its stability was assured only by the prestige and
186 ability of the ruling prince. There was as yet no sentiment of
631 solidarity, national unity, and group interest which guaranteed that the whole system would not be overthrown by some ambitious and resolute rival from among the kindred princes in outlying cities loosely subject to the authority of the prince of Kiev and envious of his power and wealth.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Kiev and envious of his power and wealth. Yaroslav himself was unable to obviate this danger. Before his death he endeavored to perpetuate the system his father and he had created by assigning the succession at Kiev to his eldest surviving son, and by apportioning to his younger sons the other important cities in the order of seniority of the princes and of the relative prestige of their several districts, with the recommendation that the younger brothers should regard the eldest as their sovereign and as the arbitrator of eventual disputes. Yet he omitted from his assignment his grandson and the descendants of his deceased brother, who thereupon constituted a potential threat to the tenure of the ruling line, even if the latter managed to keep peace among themselves.

The mode of succession established by Yaroslav thus placed the principality in the hands of a fraternal partnership. The apportionment of domains on the basis of seniority was theoretically feasible, however, only as long as the ruling family was small. But with the normal increase of direct and collateral descendants, mutual jealousies were bound to produce internal strife and to enfeeble the whole structure of the state. Mere seniority was no proof of either innate capacity or of the energy and tact required to allay disputes or to pacify ambitious rivals, and any weakness of the central authority impeded effective resistance to nomad attacks on the southern frontier. These attacks demanded at all times a vigorous defense, since cutting the Dnieper trade route meant decline of trade with Byzantium and interruption of the economic exchanges on which the prosperity of the principality depended. As it turned out, Prince Iziaslav, Yaroslav's son and successor, was unable to keep his rivals in check or even to maintain discipline among the unruly population of his capital. The Pechenegs, abolished as a menace by Yaroslav, were succeeded from 1062 by the nomad Polovtsi, whose boldness depended on what resistance they encountered. The disorders of Iziaslav's principate thus foreshadow a centrifugal movement destined to grow in volume until the preponderance of Kiev was utterly lost.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

earlier, and is reflected in the increased importance of the more remote northeastern domains of Rostov, Suzdal, and Murom, between the Oka and the Volga where the nomad menace did not reach.

While the inarticulate masses bore the brunt of the crisis, the wealth of the ruling class was for the moment not impaired, but rather enhanced. As long as the princes and their retainers were prosperous, the wealth of the Church also increased by grants and gifts. Monasteries multiplied and new churches were erected. Contact with Byzantium was still preserved. Through the expansion of the hierarchy under Greek guidance and example, the intellectual progress initiated by Yaroslav was intensified. To be sure, this culture remained aristocratic and ecclesiastical, but in this respect it hardly differed from the contemporary civilization of Western Europe, even though deprived of the continuity of classical tradition which lay at the root of the culture developed under the aegis of Rome. Marital alliances with German, Hungarian, and Polish princely families show at the same time that the Russian princes attached but slight importance to differences between the Eastern and Western Churches even after the schism of 1054.

No sooner had Vladimir Monomach died in 1125 when strife among the princes became rife once more. Competition for the control of Novgorod developed between the prince of Kiev and Monomach's son George whose domain lay at Suzdal in the northeast. Rival princes sacked and plundered one another's domains. One unpopular prince was even lynched by the angry Kievan populace. In 1149, Prince George captured Kiev himself, thus proving the vitality and resources of the northeastern area, but was unable to hold the metropolis permanently before 1155. When George died in 1160, however, the city had been fought over so constantly in the previous thirty years that practically all its dependent territory had been nipped off by neighboring principalities and it had been stripped of every element of its political prestige. Hence the possession of Kiev no longer conferred upon the ruling prince

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

the slightest claim of primacy. Indeed, George's able son Andrew entertained no respect for Kiev at all and concentrated his efforts on enriching and adorning his own northeastern domain, which he ruled so autocratically that he was assassinated in 1174. Andrew's son Vsevolod who possessed equal capacity and better judgment, was recognized as a leader by all adjacent local princes, though he interfered but little in Kievan affairs and on the western Russian frontier the prestige of Vsevolod's domain was balanced by the rise of a powerful Galician principality. Kiev itself was disastrously sacked by the Polovtsi in 1203, and of this event a chronicler wrote, "No such woe had ever befallen Kiev during the whole time since conversion."

Amid the uncertainties of Russian political life at the beginning of the thirteenth century, the shadows of future events were already gathering. The German knights were moving up the Baltic coast, where Riga was founded in 1201. Their intrusion impelled the threatened Lithuanian tribes to unity, with the result that a Lithuanian state arose which began to absorb the northwestern Russian cities, though Russian culture in turn absorbed the conquerors. The Russians were not friendly to the Latin Empire of Byzantium after 1204, and it was in 1206 that the Mongols under Temuchin (better known as Genghis Khan) began their military expansion. But the Russian princes continued their petty quarrels, not suspecting the catastrophe that was impending.

The Mongols or Tartars first reconnoitered the country west of the Caspian in 1220, and the next year they menaced the Crimea and the steppe country, thus forcing the Polovtsi to apply for support to the Russian princes against whom they had so often fought. Since 1212, Kiev had been in the possession of Prince Mstislav, a member of the ruling family of Smolensk, able, courageous, and erratic; his wife was the daughter of a Polovtsian khan. The princes of Kiev, Chernigov, and Volhynia thus united with the Polovtsi against the Tartars, whom they met on the river Kalka, in the steppes near the

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Sea of Azov, in May 1224. Though the Russians were defeated and Mstislav of Kiev with other princes was slain, the Mongols contented themselves with pursuing the fleeing remnants of the Russian force to the Dnieper and then retired to Asia. Since the casualties at the Kalka entailed several dynastic changes, the domains of Chernigov, Kiev, and Galicia were now drawn into a loose confederation, while Suzdal controlled Novgorod, which opposed the Teutonic order and subjected the Finns of Esthonia and Karelia.

Meanwhile Genghis Khan had died in 1227, and eight years later his son and successor decided to renew the campaign into Europe under the command of Genghis Khan's grandson Batu. In 1237, after subjugating the Volga Bulgars near Kazan, Batu crossed the Volga to capture and sack the city of Ryazan, about one hundred miles southeast of Moscow. During the winter of 1237-38, the Mongols turned northward and burned the city of Vladimir, east of Moscow, after a successful siege. When Prince George II of Suzdal, whose family had perished, attacked the Tartars, he was defeated and killed. The invaders next started for Novgorod, but suspended the campaign because of the spring thaw, and went into summer quarters in the south near the mouth of the Don. Chernigov fell in 1239. The following autumn the Mongols appeared before Kiev and, as the *Chronicle* says,

The Tartars took Kiev, and sacked St. Sophia and all the monasteries. And they took the icons, the holy crosses, and all church ornaments. But all the people, from small to large, they slew by the sword. This woe occurred before Christmas, on St. Nicholas' day.

By the fall of 1241, the Tartars had defeated the Poles at Liegnitz, crushed the Hungarians, and appeared before Vienna. But the fortunes of Europe changed, for Ugedei, the Great Khan, died, and Batu retired east to await the election of his successor. Yet he maintained his hegemony over Russia and

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

from the Tartars if a prince lost or surrendered his previous holdings. Hence the princes came to set more store by personal estates, and since the Tartars in their own interest were unlikely to tolerate any large principalities, the resulting dismemberment of the major units produced a large number of smaller domains, or appanages, which passed on by inheritance, whether or not the holder might become prince of some other area by the tender mercies of the Tartars. At the same time, the Tartar invasions greatly increased the number of landless peasants—dispossessed or impoverished small farmers—who became tenant farmers for large landlords on a quitrent basis.

Under Tartar hegemony the princes of Vladimir maintained at least a nominal control over the neighboring principalities and were the spokesmen of the Russian princes before the Tartar khans. These functions were, at any rate, sufficiently important and lucrative to inspire some rivalry for the possession of the title. In 1367 Prince Dmitri Donskoi erected a stone kremlin, or citadel, at Moscow and endeavored to subject the neighboring princes to his will. He met with some resistance from Prince Michael of Tver, who tried to purchase Tartar approval for himself, but was later forced to become Dmitri's vassal. The conditions of vassalage were such that dependent princes were obliged to supply Dmitri, as their overlord, with military aid, and when Dmitri won his famous victory over the Tartars in 1380 (the first case of successful Russian resistance), they supported him in this way.

The decline of the Tartars, manifested by conflicts of authority in the khanate itself, had begun almost a century before, and even prior to the year 1300 there were moments when the existence of two competing khans placed the Russian princes in a quandary. The struggle for supremacy between the princes of Tver and Moscow (which first became critical shortly before the year 1300) for supremacy as holders of the title Prince of Vladimir was also fought out in this interval. The dominance of Moscow was recognized in 1327 when Prince Ivan I secured authority to farm the Tartar taxes and began to in-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

mined independently of the princes, for one can appreciate that normal life went on even when princes shifted through inheritance or dynastic quarrels.

As a matter of fact in Novgorod, which was comparatively remote from either Kiev or Vladimir-Suzdal, the resident princes were merely delegates of the dominant state which momentarily enjoyed the lordship over the northern metropolis, but these resident princes changed so often that the citizens began to choose elective burgomasters early in the twelfth century. Eventually the princes surrendered even their control of the local courts, and in the course of time the whole administration of Novgorod and the areas it controlled became elective. The resident prince was thus transformed into a mere figurehead whose chief duty was to lead the military forces of this city-state. Popular sovereignty was expressed in the city assembly made up of all free citizens of whatever rank, and since this body was able to signify its will only by acclamation and sometimes even by pitched battles, the executive functions were exercised by a council composed of the bishop and various high elected officials, whether active or retired. The outlying domains of Novgorod—for eventually the republic colonized the territory as far as the White Sea and the Kola peninsula—enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy, but always under the surveillance of a viceroy from the metropolis, though there are cases where citizens of these colonies participated in the city assembly at Novgorod itself. Pskov began its historical career as a dependency of Novgorod, but established its independence in 1347, when the men of Novgorod bound themselves by treaty not to send any viceroy to Pskov or to exercise any further judicial rights there.

The republican principle thrived in Novgorod and Pskov because actually the princes had contributed nothing to the civic and economic growth of these areas, which owed their expansion purely to the energy of their own citizens. But in northeastern Russia the situation was quite different. There, of the two dominant forces in contemporary society (the city assembly

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

and the prince) only the prince remained, and became a landed proprietor who organized the economic activity of his subjects. If he shared his authority at all, it was not with the community but with other landed proprietors and with organs of the church to which he resigned judicial rights and the collection of dues. As early as the second half of the twelfth century, when immigration from the Kiev area to the northeastern principalities assumed large dimensions, Vladimir Monomach's grandson Prince Andrew already ruled as an autocrat in the domain of Suzdal and refused to recognize the rights either of nobles or of commoners as expressed in the town assemblies. This policy cost him his life, but after his assassination the older towns in this area were unable to maintain the principles of urban democracy even before the Tartar conquest wiped out this ideal. These towns were few in number, and the rural settlements were too scattered to acquire political cohesion. Later the onslaught of the Tartars so much impoverished even such towns as then existed that their pauperized inhabitants were more concerned about their daily bread than about political rights. Furthermore, the choice and confirmation of princes depended for the time being on the caprices of the invaders, so that this function, which had formerly belonged in practice to the city assembly, died out altogether, and when the assemblies occasionally convened, it was generally with the intention of rioting and revolting against Tartar exactions. The prince, ruling on Tartar sufferance, thus became the sole remaining possessor of local authority.

As we have seen, not until the middle of the fifteenth century was it absolutely clear that the nucleus of statehood in eastern Russia was definitely located at Moscow. By that time, the regional princes were permanently attached to their several domains which they ruled as feudal lords, supported by the contributions paid by the subjects who worked their lands, and there was no difference between minor and major princes in their proprietary attitude toward their landed possessions. Since their interests were thus predominantly economic, these

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

princes began to develop a new group of aids who administered these interests, and such aids (who were actually officials, not nobles concerned with warfare) evolved into a new form of prince's council, or *duma*. The larger domains were split up into districts around important towns, and the districts into minor administrative divisions, all handled by appointees of the prince. These officials were far less concerned with the maintenance of public order or of civil rights than with seeing that the prince received his due financial return from the subject population, although church properties were usually exempt from their attentions. It is thus an open question whether there was any public law whatever in the early Muscovite period. In any event, the system shows the characteristic features of medieval feudalism: the dismemberment of state authority and its fusion with land ownership.

The rise of Moscow naturally produced a slow recovery from this parcellation, as the minor regional princes either voluntarily or under pressure surrendered their domains to the more powerful center. Novgorod was annexed outright by Ivan III after conquest had seriously diminished its outlying possessions. But especially during the last half of the fourteenth century, the gravitation toward Moscow moved with ever-increasing speed. On the other hand, the early Muscovite princes handled their new acquisitions purely as personal property. They bequeathed sections of it to their heirs, although soon it was the recognized practice to bequeath the lion's share to the oldest son. The logical conclusion from this tendency was first drawn by Ivan III after witnessing as a youth the vicissitudes of his father Basil II, who had almost lost the Muscovite domain because of feudal rivalries. Ivan refused to dismember his domain even in the interest of members of his family. His title of Great Prince (or Grand Duke) of all Rus he interpreted not merely in an honorific but in a juridical sense, and made it clear that he considered the whole domain as his personal patrimony. In this attitude he was confirmed less by pure selfishness than by the realization that only a unified state could

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

175* 631 421 resist both the Tartars and Lithuania, though in his will he did not break entirely with tradition, but bequeathed to his eldest son two-thirds of his landed possessions. Even so, however, the remaining regional princes ceased to be a menace, and the fact that his younger son was bound to serve Basil III as his overlord made the latter "sovereign of all Rus" in fact as well as in name. Such few regional princes as still existed merely held estates with rights of judgment and tribute, and were factually subject to the prince of Moscow. The title of tsar was first used by Ivan III in 1484, and in 1502 his son, Basil II, added the title "autocrat" (*samoderzhets*).

175* Such is the political, economic, and ideological process by which the power of Kiev was dissipated and, despite the competition of Lithuania, what was once a mere hunting lodge of the princes of Suzdal and Vladimir became the nucleus around which the modern Russian state took shape. It would be idle to pretend that this ideal was not realized without abundant propaganda from the Orthodox clergy who, particularly after the fall of Constantinople, wished to see the Prince of Moscow the head of Orthodox Christianity and the heir of Rome. Under the pressure of this new tradition, Basil III in particular, as the son of a princess of Byzantium, adorned his court with new ceremonial and assumed the device of the doubleheaded eagle which had belonged to his Byzantine forebears.

175* 643 Thus the personal rule which had its origins in the decline of republican usages in northeastern Russia both before and since the Tartar conquest evolved into an absolutism founded upon dynastic tradition and supported by a nationalistic legend propagated by the church. The Muscovite tsar was not only the owner of his domain; he was God's anointed whom his subjects could approach only with fear and awe. The tsar's will was the will of God. As the heir of the Byzantine emperors, he acquired new authority over the church as the defender of the Orthodox faith. He confirmed the appointment of metropolitans and archbishops, even sometimes naming them without calling church councils, and clerics referred their disputes

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

VI

German and Slav

While speaking of the process by which the Western and some of the Southern Slavs were converted to Christianity, it has been mentioned that German missionary efforts were accompanied by widespread colonization not only along the Danube but likewise in Central Germany itself. It may be recalled also that, after the Germanic migrations, the Slavs by the sixth century had expanded from their former boundary at the Vistula westward to the Elbe and simultaneously occupied the Baltic coast from the peninsula of Jutland eastward to the former Polish corridor. While they were in Bohemia and Moravia, as well as in the Vistula basin, they set up large and comparatively strong Slavic social and political organizations which, despite many handicaps, have maintained themselves down into modern history. But the Slavs who occupied the course of the Elbe and the Baltic seaboard formed nothing more than weak tribal federations which not only possessed little internal cohesion but also collapsed easily at any external shock. At the same time the Slavs south of the Danube, and especially the Slovenes, were unable to form lasting ties with any more powerful Slavic group which would guarantee them against German pressure and infiltration; consequently they were gradually forced to contract into their present restricted frontiers.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

the Austrian authorities, might have had incalculable consequences for the maintenance of their Empire.

The ideals preached by Palacký, who was as great a journalist as he was a historian, were first formulated in political terms just prior to the revolutionary year 1848, which signalized the end of Metternich's regime and the dawn of constitutionalism in Austria. It was thus Palacký who advocated an autonomous Bohemia including all the lands which had formerly belonged to the Bohemian crown, together with as much of Hungary as was populated by Slovaks: the principle, indeed, upon which the Czechoslovak state was subsequently erected. It is significant, moreover, that the German elements in Bohemia were inclined to support the Czechs in their agitation for autonomy. But the federal idea was never realized in Austria-Hungary before the monarchy dissolved in 1918, and Bohemian hopes in this direction were dashed by the Austrian Constitution of 1867, which gave the Hungarians a preferred position, as compared with the Slavs, by establishing the principle of dualism, by making Hungary practically autonomous, and by settling the Magyar domination upon Slovaks and Croats. This loss was to some extent offset by educational concessions to the Czechs, since in the previous twenty years Bohemian national consciousness had consolidated to an extraordinary degree through the increased use of the native language and the improved status of both peasants and the middle class. The romantic emphasis laid by Palacký on the glorious past of Bohemia thus proved an altogether healthy spur to the national ambition.

Though after 1867 there was never any real reconciliation between Prague and Vienna, the material prosperity of Bohemia advanced rapidly in the next fifty years, and the part still played by the German element in Bohemia before the war of 1914 is evidenced by the fact that, though they comprised only 37 per cent of the population, they paid 50 per cent of the taxes. But while the Czechs never lost sight of the federalist ideal, this principle was looked on with disfavor by the Viennese